

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
DANVILLE DIVISION

CHERYL DIANNE DAVIS,)
Plaintiff,)
v.)
HAIRPLUS-REGIS CORP.,)
Defendant.)
) 4:10CV00039
) **ORDER**
)
) By: Jackson L. Kiser
) Senior United States District Judge

Before me is Defendant HairPlus-Regis Corporation’s Motion for Summary Judgment and supporting brief. Def.’s Mot. for Summ. J., Mar. 11, 2011, ECF No. 14; Br. in Supp. of Mot. for Summ. J., Mar. 11, 2011, ECF No. 15. The Defendant also mailed a Roseboro notice to the pro se Plaintiff, Cheryl Davis, informing her that she may respond to its Summary Judgment Motion “by offering affidavits...or by filing sworn statements” and “fil[ing] a legal brief in opposition” within twenty days. Def.’s Mot. for Summ. J. 1-2. The Plaintiff did not file a response. Instead, she appeared at the April 7th, 2011 motion hearing with two witnesses whom she intended to put on the witness stand to testify, which the Court did not permit. For the reasons stated in the accompanying Memorandum Opinion, the Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment is **GRANTED** and the Clerk of the Court is directed to **DISMISS** this case from the docket.

ENTERED this 14th day of April, 2011.

s/Jackson L. Kiser
Senior United States District Judge